UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.3022*
18 December 1991

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE THOUSAND AND TWENTY-SECOND MEETING*

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 12 December 1991, at 4.30 p.m.

President:	Mr. VORONTSOV	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Members:	Austria	Mr. HOHENFELLNER
	Belgium	Mr. NOTERDAEME
	China	Mr. JIN Yongjian
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANOH
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA
	Ecuador	Mr. AYALA LASSO
	France	Mr. MERIMEE
	India	Mr. MENON
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States	Mr. WATSON
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ALFI
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI
	Zimbabwe	Mr. MUMBENGEGWI

* Reissued for technical reasons.

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

91-62067 8168V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.55 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS:

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS (S/23263 and Add.1)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to inform the Security Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Canada, Cyprus, Greece and Turkey, in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Mavrommatis (Cyprus), Mr. Exarchos (Greece) and Mr. Aksin (Turkey) took places at the Council table; Mr. Kirsch (Canada) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to recall that in the course of the Council's consultations members of the Council agreed that an invitation should be extended to Mr. Osman Ertug in accordance with rule 39 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure. Unless I hear any objection, I shall take it that the Council decides to invite Mr. Ertug in accordance with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the appropriate moment I shall invite Mr. Ertug to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

The Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations. Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operations in Cyprus in document S/23263 and Add.1. Members of the Council also have before them document S/23281, containing the text of a draft resolution which was prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Austria, Belgium, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, France, India, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire, Zimbabwe

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has been adopted unanimously as resolution 723 (1991).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the vote.

Mr. HOHENFELLNER (Austria): In its resolution 698 (1991) of 14 June 1991, the Security Council undertook to decide, in the light of a requested report by the Secretary-General and by the time of the next extension of the mandate of United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) on or before 15 December 1991, on measures to be taken to put the Force on a sound and secure financial basis. With resolution 723 (1991) adopted just a few minutes ago, the Council extended UNFICYP's mandate but did not put it on such a basis. Therefore the Council has either violated its own undertaking contained in resolution 698 (1991), or it has decided to be undecided and, by its inaction, taken a negative decision.

There is absolutely no need for me to repeat here yet again all the arguments in favour of putting UNFICYP on a sound and secure financial basis, as repeatedly proposed by the Secretary-General, most recently in his report S/23144 of 15 October 1991. They are contained in that report and in various documents submitted by the troop-contributing States. It is no coincidence that all other peace-keeping operations are funded by assessed contributions in accordance with Article 17 (2) of the Charter of the United Nations. The Secretary-General's well-founded recommendation and these arguments were among the reasons why a move towards assessed contributions would have found the support of an overwhelming majority of Council members, to whom we are grateful. The counterarguments advanced by some members, all of them permanent members, were, to put it mildly, not convincing.

(Mr. Hohenfellner, Austria)

No other peace-keeping operation has been so thoroughly studied and reviewed as UNFICYP. It is already, in relation to size, the least costly of all United Nations peace-keeping operations for the international community. Consequently, it is the most costly for a troop contributor. We are on average bearing two thirds of the cost of our participation ourselves anyway. And yet, if the Council had been allowed to decide on a move towards assessed contributions, further savings for the United Nations in the order of 30 per cent would have been possible, thanks to the understanding shown on the part of troop contributors. Temporary internal difficulties, be they financial or others, must not be allowed to interfere with allowing this Council to exercise its responsibilities, for otherwise the credibility of this important organ will suffer.

What United Nations peace-keeping is all about is solidarity, solidarity of the international community with those who are in need of support. This solidarity can have many forms, but for it to be credible and meaningful it cannot limit itself to creating a peace-keeping operation and voting for the extension of its mandate. Solidarity has to take the form of financial contributions and it can take the form of contributing personnel.

Austria, for its part, has shown solidarity with Cyprus by providing one of the largest contingents now for over 27 years. I can say in all sincerity that this solidarity was shown with no ulterior motives in mind. We have no interests in Cyprus, neither historical, economic, geopolitical or otherwise.

Austria and, I should imagine, other troop contributors as well, will now have to reflect on their future role in UNFICYP in the light of the failure of some members of the Council to react positively. Austria will now seriously study its options and re-examine its continued participation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I invite the representative of Canada to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KIRSCH (Canada): Let me offer you, Sir, our congratulations on your assumption of the presidency for the month of December.

I am very grateful to the members of the Security Council for giving me the opportunity to participate in this afternoon's meeting and to say a few words about the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus.

Members of the Council will know, however, that it had not been the original intention of my delegation to speak at this meeting, but rather at another meeting of the Council that would have addressed the financial aspects of the Force.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

Members of the Council will also know that the serious financial difficulties confronting the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) have reached crisis proportions. Indeed, the Security Council acknowledged this fact in a presidential statement of 15 June 1990 (S/21361) when the accumulated arrears to the UNFICYP account stood at $179.3 million. Today, that deficit stands at $186.1 million and continues to grow each day.

Almost one year ago exactly, I spoke in the Council about this problem at a time when the UNFICYP troop contributors were working to put the Force on a sound and secure financial basis. One week later Ambassador Fortier addressed the Council following the adoption of resolution 682 (1990) and outlined the many efforts that had been undertaken to convince certain permanent members of the need to place UNFICYP on a system of assessed contributions.

I will not repeat that outline today. I will, however, remind the members of the Council - and in particular its permanent members, countries that bear a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security - of the continuing efforts of the UNFICYP troop contributors over the past year to see this issue settled once and for all.

Those efforts indeed culminated in proposals that the Council establish a system of assessed contributions for UNFICYP as of 1 January 1992. Members of the Council will recall resolution 698 (1991) of 14 June 1991. Operative paragraph 3 of that resolution stated that the the Security Council

> "undertakes to decide, in the light of [the report of the Secretary-General] and by the time of the next extension of UNFICYP's mandate on or before 15 December 1991, on measures to be taken to put the Force onto a sound and secure financial basis."

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

The Secretary-General's report was issued on 15 October 1991, as document S/23144, and made it clear that there is no viable alternative to assessed contributions to resolve UNFICYP's financial crisis. Clearly, therefore, any proposal to establish such a system of assessed contributions should have been considered in a separate meeting of the Council immediately prior to the meeting that is now taking place.

Unfortunately, once again most of the permanent members of the Council opposed the use of assessed contributions to finance UNFICYP and indicated that they would not support the establishment of such a system at this time. It follows, therefore, that the Security Council has not fulfilled its undertaking as contained in resolution 698 (19[illegible]).

Canada is most grateful to the several delegations within the Security Council for their efforts to resolve this problem, and we understand fully the reasons why, in the absence of support from most permanent members of the Security Council, they decided not to submit a proposal to a vote this afternoon.

We are also grateful to our fellow troop contributors in UNFICYP and to the Government of Cyprus for their efforts and support over the past 27 years. Nevertheless, we must reluctantly conclude that certain permanent members of the Security Council will not - at least in the foreseeable future - allow the Council to resolve UNFICYP's financing difficulties.

This most regrettable decision is not unrelated to the wider question of the continuing role and nature of the United Nations peace-keeping effort in Cyprus.

Canada is greatly disturbed about the lack of a negotiated settlement to the Cyprus problem after so many years. We know that efforts to achieve a settlement are continuing, and we support them fully.

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

We support them because we know that peace-keeping is not an end in itself. Peace-keeping does not solve the problem. Rather, its purpose is to create the conditions conducive to the negotiation of a fair and equitable settlement. Unfortunately, after 27 years, and despite considerable efforts, the United Nations has not been able to broker such a settlement in Cyprus.

If such a settlement continues to elude the United Nations it will be important for the Security Council to undertake a thorough review of the long-term future of UNFICYP. Such a review should consider not only how to reduce the expenditure of scarce resources on a process which is stalled but also the role of the Force itself.

Financial pressures on the United Nations and its Member States, as well as competing demands for peace-keeping troops elsewhere in the world, make such a review essential. This is particularly relevant as the Council considers the creation of peace-keeping operations on a scale unprecedented in the history of the Organization. Canada is prepared to take part in such a review.

The UNFICYP troop-contributing countries have been carrying the financial burden of the Force for more than 27 years and were willing to minimize their future claims in order to reduce the costs to the United Nations and its Member States under a system of assessed contributions. It simply is not fair to ask the troop contributors to continue to bear this disproportionate burden indefinitely.

Canada remains committed to the search for a peaceful settlement in Cyprus, and for the time being - for the time being - we remain committed to maintaining our participation in UNFICYP. Earlier this afternoon I informed the Secretary-General, through Under-Secretary-General Marrack Goulding, that

(Mr. Kirsch, Canada)

Canada will maintain its current troop contribution to UNFICYP for the next six months should the Council, as it did, decide to extend its mandate at today's meeting.

Members of the Council will appreciate, however, that Canada's current contribution to the United Nations presence in Cyprus cannot be taken for granted indefinitely. We will, therefore, for all of the reasons I have outlined this afternoon, be reviewing our continuing participation in UNFICYP.

In conclusion, and in view of expensive peace-keeping operations that may be established in such places as Cambodia and Yugoslavia, I would like to place on record the position of my Government that the essential principle of using assessed financing for peace-keeping operations be maintained. Furthermore, such a system of financing should be extended as soon as possible to the United Nations Force in Cyprus.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Canada for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Cyprus, upon whom I now call.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): Permit me at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. It is a particular pleasure to see you, the Permanent Representative of the Soviet Union, a country with which my own country has always maintained the most cordial of relations, steering the work of the Security Council, particularly at this juncture in international developments.

At the same time, I kindly request you, Mr. President, to convey to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Romania, most well-deserved congratulations. It is only fitting to note and pay tribute to the exemplary and skilful manner in which the important work of the Council was guided during the month of November. Indicative of this was the orderly manner in which the selection process for the new Secretary-General of the United Nations was conducted, culminating in the Council's recommendation to the General Assembly of the name of Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express our most sincere thanks and appreciation to all the members of the Council for unanimously adopting resolution 723 (1991). Our sincerest gratitude and thanks are also extended to the troop-contributor countries of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), which, despite the deepening financial crisis facing the Force, have continued unwaveringly during the last mandate to maintain their forces in UNFICYP and their services at the highest level of professionalism, which is now synonymous with UNIFCYP. For their continuing support we can but state our thanks and express the hope that the imperative need to maintain UNFICYP at the levels required to carry out its duties successfully will be recognized as long as necessary.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The renewal of UNFICYP's mandate for a further six-month period, together with the Secretary-General's mission of good offices, is indicative of the continued interest and earnest commitment of the Security Council in particular, and of the United Nations as a whole, to finding a just and viable solution to the Cyprus problem. It is appropriate and fitting at this time to express our most heartfelt thanks and appreciation to the Commander of UNFICYP, General Clive Milner, to his officers and men and to the Secretary-General's Special Representative in Cyprus, Ambassador Oscar Camilion, Under-Secretary-General Marrack Goulding and the Alternate Special Representative, Mr. Gustave Feissel. All have, within the mandate of their responsibilities, worked tirelessly in the execution of their duties.

The resolutions of the Security Council pertaining to the question of Cyprus, whether they be in the form of the one just adopted, renewing the mandate of UNFICYP, or of resolution 716 (1991), which reaffirms all previous Security Council resolutions on Cyprus, gain additional significance and importance in the light of the completion of the term of office of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar. The added significance of the Council's most recent substantive resolution, resolution 716 (1991), is that it allows the new Secretary-General to assume his duties and consideration of the Cyprus problem with the necessary infrastructure and with the United Nations doctrine and approach to the question of Cyprus firmly in place and enjoying the support of the international community.

It is appropriate, I believe, to reiterate that the resolution of the Cyprus problem is to be based on adherence to and implementation of the Security Council resolutions and full respect for the purposes and principles of the Charter as well as the norms of international law.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus remains committed to a solution of the Cyprus problem based on those component elements. We shall continue to be so, despite the obstacles placed by Turkey in the path, thus far, of the Secretary-General's efforts and, by extension, of the will of the international community to solve the Cyprus problem.

As regards the most important issue of UNFICYP's finances, I should like to reiterate the importance that we attach to the Force's continued presence in such numbers as would permit it to discharge effectively and efficaciously its functions so necessary at this particular juncture.

It is paradoxical, if not anachronistic, that UNFICYP is the only exception to the general rule of financing United Nations operations by assessed contributions. Whilst expressing our gratitude to countries providing contingents, we strongly plead with them not to take any action that might put in jeopardy the most successful of all United Nations peace-keeping operations. At the same time, we appeal to all members of the Security Council to deal with this problem expeditiously, in a manner commensurate with its importance and along the traditional lines that obtain in all other similar operations.

We listened very carefully to the statements of the Permanent Representative of Austria and the representative of Canada, and we noted everything they said. We very much regret that it has as yet not been found possible to put UNFICYP's finances on a sound and secure basis. As everybody knows, we have done our level best to assist in arriving at an appropriate solution.

I shall, as always, attempt to give briefly a chronology of the events since the last renewal, on 14 June 1991, of the mandate of UNFICYP and the Secretary-General's good offices mission.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

A flurry of activities centring on Ankara and Nicosia followed that renewal, and efforts were intensified, especially in July and August 1991.

President Bush of the United States of America visited Athens and Ankara in mid-July, and on 2 August it was announced in the United States that an international meeting concerning Cyprus chaired by the Secretary-General was planned for September.

The shuttle diplomacy by Mr. Camilion and Mr. Feissel continued. By mid-August concrete ideas had been elaborated, and Ankara was more than supportive of the international meeting.

There was an all-pervasive optimism till early September, not because people had forgotten that every time, for almost three years now, the negotiations were reaching the moment of truth, which, given the necessary political volition, could lead to a breakthrough, Turkey and Mr. Denktash would come up with untenable demands; and not because anybody forgot that in February 1990 Mr. Denktash did not even allow the talks to begin in New York; but because everybody thought that surely this time Turkey could not afford to ignore commitments to none other than the President of the United States. And yet it did that, in its usual unabashed manner.

It was inevitable that a stern warning in the form of a Security Council resolution was necessary in order to set the record straight and put an end once and for all to misrepresentations of resolution 649 (1990) and to behaviour that is totally unacceptable in international relations.

Thus when the Security Council adopted unanimously, only two months ago, on 11 October 1991, resolution 716 (1991), everybody was aware that its raison d'être was the same as that which had led to the adoption of resolution 649 (1990) in March 1990. At that time the intended negotiations under the auspices of the Secretary-General did not even begin, as I have said. They

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

collapsed when the Turkish side attempted to introduce concepts and preconditions contrary to the Council's mandate.

This time similar insistence by the Turkish Cypriots on yet more unacceptable preconditions, and an unexpected reneging by Turkey on all indications of flexibility and goodwill given to the Secretary-General's representatives and to interested countries during the intense series of consultations of the summer months, obliged the Security Council to adopt resolution 716 (1991).

After studying the report of the Secretary-General (S/23121) of 8 October 1991, which, inter alia, explained that once again an impasse had been reached because the Turkish Cypriot leader asserted that his side would claim a right to secession and that Mr. Denktash

"sought extensive changes in the text of ideas that were discussed",

(S/23121, para. 17)

the Security Council deemed it necessary to adopt a resolution as the appropriate leverage that would dislodge the monolithic obstacles blocking the negotiating process.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Resolution 716 (1991), as we know, endorsed the Secretary-General's report, the very same report that the Turkish side criticized harshly and called unsatisfactory. Furthermore, it reaffirmed all previous Security Council resolutions on Cyprus and set out very clearly all the agreed principles contained in these resolutions and in the 1977 and 1979 high-level agreements. By reaffirming the Security Council's position on the Cyprus question, it also defined with precision and indisputable clarity the parameters within which a just solution must be sought.

Permit me to recall that, as stated in paragraph 3 of resolution 716 (1991):

> "... the fundamental principles of a Cyprus settlement are the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus; the exclusion of union in whole or in part with any other country and any form of partition or secession".

There is no doubt in anybody's mind that this paragraph constitutes unequivocally a definite and final rejection of the Turkish side's demands for separate sovereignty and a right to self-determination. Even if we were to assume that there remained the slightest element of skepticism regarding the meaning of paragraph 3, there is also paragraph 5, which:

> "Calls upon the parties to adhere fully to these principles and to negotiate within the framework of them without introducing concepts that are at variance with them".

This clarification and reaffirmation leave no room at all for any misrepresentation whatsoever.

The Government of the Republic of Cyprus considered resolution 716 (1991) positive and accepted it as the expression of the collective will of the international community to remove the obstacles so that a solution to the

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

Cyprus problem can be found on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions, the high-level agreements and the principles of international law. In addition, my Government is on record as stating that it is ready to do its utmost for the achievement of the objectives set out in resolution 716 (1991).

In stark contrast, on 12 October, a day after the unanimous adoption of this resolution, Mr. Denktash rejected it in anger, describing it as "totally unacceptable". On the same day, his regime decided to close the so-called borders - referring to the Attila line that divides Cyprus by the force of arms - to United Nations personnel and foreign diplomats for 48 hours as a protest against the Security Council's decision.

Turkey's reaction was rather belated but no less disappointing. It came by way of a long letter signed by the then Turkish Foreign Minister, Mr. Safa Giray, which was circulated as a document of the General Assembly and of the Security Council (S/23156) at the request of the Permanent Representative of Turkey to the United Nations.

The main purpose of this letter was to reaffirm the Turkish Government's position on Cyprus and purportedly "to clarify in this light" its understanding of the various elements of resolution 716 (1991). It stated that Turkey had "certain reservations and objections" and it went on to make a number of untenable interpretations of the Security Council resolution. Notwithstanding the fact that the Security Council not only endorsed his report and observations but also "commended the Secretary-General for his efforts during the past few months", as stated in paragraph 1 of resolution 716 (1991), the Turkish Foreign Minister saw fit to reiterate his Government's objection to certain aspects of this report.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

The least that Turkey, or any other Member State of the United Nations for that matter, could do was to remember - especially after the Gulf crisis and its stern warning - that Security Council resolutions, given their nature, cannot be subjected to arbitrary or selective interpretation, nor can their acceptance be made subject to any kind of precondition.

This message, however, seems to have been lost on the new Government of Prime Minister Suleyman Domirel, who, in his address to the Grand Assembly of Turkey on 25 November, in contradiction to Security Council resolution 716 (1991), referred to the sovereignty of each Cypriot community. As to Mr. Denktash, his intransigence and perpetual adherence to anachronistic concepts and hard-line positions were reiterated in a lengthy interview given recently to a Greek-Cypriot newspaper, the gist of which was expressed in the arrogant remark: "We are not bound by whatever we said 'yes' to in the past." Such statements and declarations are in direct violation of Security Council calls for the parties concerned to refrain from any action that could aggravate the present delicate phase through which the Cyprus question is going.

At this point, I wish to stress that the United Nations resolutions on Cyprus are directed at all parties concerned in Cyprus, not just the two communities. The involvement of States parties is reaffirmed by resolution 716 (1991), in particular by its operative paragraphs 5 and 7. It is of paramount importance that all States involved in the issue exert sincere and practical efforts towards making rapid progress in the negotiating process by fully conforming to the criteria for a solution and to the principles repeatedly affirmed by the United Nations resolutions and by the two high-level agreements.

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

In any circumstance, it is now up to the Security Council not only to follow closely actions and reactions to resolution 716 (1991), but to ensure that this resolution is implemented without any further delay. We have all listened to the problems and to the statement just made by the representative of Canada. The Security Council and each and every one of its members know fully well who is to blame and who is preventing the settlement. Resolution 716 (1991) and the report on which it was based are crystal clear. It is now up to the members of the Security Council to take appropriate remedial action based on that resolution.

Finally, I conclude by reiterating my country's and my personal sentiments of appreciation to Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar upon his relinquishing, after 10 successful years, his present duties. This is the last meeting that will be held on the Cyprus question during his tenure. I have known the Secretary-General for a very long time and have had every opportunity to observe closely his modus operandi, not only in respect of the problem of Cyprus - which he has served so well in the capacity of Special Representative, Under-Secretary-General and Secretary-General, in an exemplary manner, bringing it close to solution on more than one occasion - but also in his approach to the plethora of issues he has had to deal with, ranging from human rights to conflict resolution.

Even upon a first meeting with him, one cannot fail to notice immediately his deep knowledge of the subject, his urbanity, his ability to remain unruffled even in the face of adversities, or his approach and style, exemplified by his ability to chart a correct course during the recent evolutionary processes. We all, and particularly Cyprus, owe him a debt of gratitude.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Cyprus for his statement and for his kind words addressed to my country and to myself.

I now call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece): At the outset, let me congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of December. I am certain that under your experienced and distinguished guidance the Security Council will carry out its work with great effectiveness and success. I take this opportunity to extend congratulations to your predecessor, the Ambassador of Romania Aurel Dragos Munteanu, for the skill and leadership he displayed in the exercise of his duties during the month of November.

The Greek Government fully shares the view expressed by the Secretary-General in his latest reports to the Security Council - contained in documents S/23144 of 15 October 1991, and S/23263 of 30 November 1991 - that the presence and the role of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) remain indispensable. It has therefore concurred in the extension of the Force's mandate for six more months, having taken note of the agreement to that effect of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, exercising its exclusive and sovereign right with respect to this matter. This is all the more so because the expectations raised since last June for achieving progress towards a negotiated solution of the problem of Cyprus have proven unfortunately to be so far without effect.

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

The chronic and ever deepening problem of the financing of UNFICYP is a cause of deep concern to my Government. The financial situation of the Force places in jeopardy a very successful peace-keeping operation. Greece fully endorses the recommendation of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, who in his report to the Council relative to the financing of UNFICYP emphasized that

"given the unsatisfactory and unjust nature of present arrangements, I should like to reiterate my long-standing recommendation that the Council approve the funding of the cost of UNFICYP from 1 January 1992 through assessed contributions on the peace-keeping scale". (S/23144, para. 25)

My Government appeals to all members of the Security Council to ensure proper and just financing of UNFICYP, as they have done for all the peace-keeping operations they have authorized. In that context, allow me to state once more my Government's pledge to maintain the level of its total contribution at the present voluntary amount of $800,000 per annum even if a new system brings its assessed contribution to a lower level.

On behalf of my Government I wish to express our sincere appreciation to the Governments of the troop-contributing countries for their continuing commitment to the cause of peace in Cyprus. The very existence of UNFICYP would be at stake without their valuable support. We are indeed indebted to them.

Thanks and deep appreciation are also extended to the Commander of UNFICYP, Major-General Clive Milner, and to all officers and men under his command.

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

The report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council, document S/23121 of 8 October 1991, epitomizes his tireless and principled efforts in recent months in the framework of his mission of good offices with a view to safeguarding the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of the Republic of Cyprus and establishing a new constitutional arrangement that would regulate the relations of the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities on a federal, bi-communal and bi-zonal basis.

The Secretary-General clearly indicates in the same report, particularly in paragraphs 17 and 19, that the Turkish side bears full responsibility for the new stalemate.

The Security Council commended the Secretary-General for his efforts, and endorsed his report and observations in resolution 716 (1991) of 11 October 1991. Furthermore, the Security Council reaffirmed its previous resolutions on the Cyprus problem and its consistent position on the fundamental principles of a lasting settlement, namely the sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity and non-alignment of the Republic of Cyprus as well as the exclusion of union in whole or in part with any other country and any form of partition or secession. Also, in its paragraph 5, resolution 716 (1991) called upon the parties to negotiate without introducing concepts that are at variance with the fundamental principles of a Cyprus settlement.

While my Government welcomed resolution 716 (1991) and most emphatically reiterated its readiness and willingness to cooperate with the Secretary-General, the Government of Turkey and Mr. Denktash, the leader of

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

the Turkish Cypriot Community, responsible for the stalemate, have in no uncertain terms criticized the report of the Secretary-General on his mission of good offices as well as "its authors".

Therefore, the negative reactions of Mr. Denktash as endorsed and expressed in a letter by the Turkish Government contained in document S/23156 of 21 October 1991, in the form of "well-founded reservations and objections" (S/23156, annex) concerning resolution 716 (1991), indicate that once more they both continue to ignore and disregard deliberately a resolution adopted unanimously by the Security Council.

The problem of Cyprus is and remains a problem of the invasion and foreign occupation of the territory of an independent State Member of the United Nations by another Member State. It constitutes a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, of the Security Council's resolutions on Cyprus and of the Charter of Paris for a New Europe, which was signed also by Turkey.

I will spare the Council the well-known and duly documented details regarding the tragic situation of the 200,000 refugees deprived of their ancestral homes and property and denied freedom of movement, the deliberate policy of Turkey aiming at changing the demography of Cyprus by implanting 80,000 Turkish settlers on the occupied territory of the island, the plight of the enclaved persons and the unwillingness of the Turkish side to cooperate in ascertaining the fate of the 1,619 missing persons.

In a few weeks the term of the Secretary-General, Mr. Perez de Cuellar, will expire. On behalf of the Greek Government I convey to him our deep appreciation and high esteem for his valuable, principled and consistent efforts to promote a lasting and just solution of the Cyprus problem. His

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

moral integrity as well as his patience and perseverance are admirable. His quiet diplomacy in the quest for peace in Cyprus has certainly been acknowledged by the international community. Let me also extend our sincere thanks and appreciation to his Special Representative in Cyprus, Mr. Oscar Camillion and to the alternate special representative, Mr. Gustave Feissel, for their unrelenting assistance to the Secretary-General.

Although disappointed by the lack of tangible progress so far in the search for a negotiated solution we are, however, encouraged by the fact that the international community is displaying increased interest in assisting the Secretary-General in his efforts to reunify the last European country that remains divided and occupied due to the continuing presence of more than 35,000 Turkish soldiers.

At this moment, I can only express the hope that the next report of the Secretary-General on his mission of good offices, which is still to come in accordance with resolution 716 (1991), will pave the way towards finding a solution to the problem of Cyprus. But that can only happen if Turkey effectively and sincerely cooperates by complying with all relevant United Nations resolutions, and in particular with resolution 716 (1991).

Let no one be in doubt that my Government, in close cooperation with the Government of the Republic of Cyprus, will fully support the Secretary-General-designate, Mr. Boutros Boutros Ghali, in the mission of good offices entrusted to him by the Security Council for finding a just and lasting solution of the Cyprus problem.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Greece for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is Mr. Osman Ertug, to whom the Council has extended an invitation in conformity with rule 39 of its provisional rules of procedure. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ERTUG: It is a pleasure for me to be here today to address the Security Council on the subject of the renewal of the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). I should like to thank you, Mr. President, and through you the other members of the Council for having given me the opportunity to do so. I should like also to extend my congratulations to you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of December. I have no doubt that your vast experience and diplomatic skills will guarantee successful guidance of the deliberations of the Council.

My congratulations go also to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Romania, for the competent and successful manner in which he conducted the Council's work during the month of November.

I do not intend to take up much of the Council's valuable time with a detailed statement. My purpose is to utilize this opportunity - the only one my side has - to recall the reason why the Cyprus question has remained unresolved for the past 28 years. After all, that is why UNFICYP has remained on the island for the past 27 years, and that is why the Security Council is burdened with the task of meeting every six months in connection with this matter, amidst growing concern over the difficulties of financing the Force.

(Mr. Ertug)

The Council is well aware of how, by whom and for what purpose the bi-communal Republic of Cyprus was deliberately destroyed upon the expulsion of the Turkish Cypriot component from the entire State apparatus back in 1963. I will therefore refrain from repeating these well-known and well-documented facts. We believe, however, that the recognition of the Greek Cypriot regime, which emerged as a result of this coup against the bi-communal Republic, as the legitimate Government of Cyprus was a historic error, with far-reaching implications. Had it been avoided, there would not have been a Cyprus question today.

My intention in stating these facts is not to apportion blame or to try to rewrite history, but rather to recall the origins of a grave injustice that has been done, and continues to be done, to my people. As we seek a remedy for this injustice, it is not fair to ask the Turkish Cypriots to build their future on the ruins of the past, or of the now-defunct bi-communal Republic of Cyprus, but rather on a sound, new political partnership, which will not be subject to the whim of the Greek Cypriots.

As the search for a negotiated solution to the Cyprus question continues, it is crucially important for us to know whether or not the Greek Cypriot leadership is prepared to acknowledge these facts. It does not have to look far in order to realize what has been at issue between the two peoples of the island since the beginning of the conflict. Mr. Glafkos Clerides, a prominent Greek Cypriot politician and former Greek Cypriot negotiator at the intercommunal talks, states the following in volume III of his memoirs, entitled "Cyprus: My Deposition":

(Mr. Ertug)

"Just as the Greek Cypriot preoccupation was that Cyprus should be a Greek Cypriot State, with a protected Turkish Cypriot minority, the Turkish preoccupation was to defeat any such effort and to maintain the partnership concept, which in their opinion the Zurich Agreement created between the two communities. The conflict, therefore, was a conflict of principle and for that principle both sides were prepared to go on arguing and even, if need be, to fight, rather than compromise.

"The same principle is still in conflict, even today, though a federal solution has been accepted - and though a federation is nothing more than a constitutional partnership of the component States, provinces or cantons which make up the federation."

In spite of the acknowledgement of this fact even by some prominent Greek Cypriots, the Greek Cypriot leadership insists on misrepresenting the Cyprus question as being one of invasion and occupation. This approach clearly shows how far the Greek Cypriot side is from a negotiated solution. We cannot hope to find the right remedy by making the wrong diagnosis as to the nature of the illness.

The Turkish Cypriot side rejects all claims that the Cyprus question is a problem of invasion and occupation. Such claims are aimed at misrepresenting the Cyprus issue as a question between Turkey and the Greek Cypriots. This approach, which totally ignores the existence of the Turkish Cypriots as an equal party, does not correspond to reality, and will certainly not lead to a just and lasting settlement.

Similarly, we cannot accept any assertion or even suggestion that the Greek Cypriots, under the guise of the Republic of Cyprus, are sovereign over us or over the whole of Cyprus. Such claims have no basis in reality,

(Mr. Ertug)

legality or morality. We have no claim to be sovereign over the Greek Cypriots or over the whole of Cyprus. Let them have no claim of sovereignty over us or over the whole island so that we may, as equals, be able to establish a partnership, which will be a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation.

It will be recalled that when the independent Republic of Cyprus was established in 1960, sovereignty was transferred to both communities, not just to one of them. When we were thrown out of that Republic by force of arms a mere three years later, we did not surrender our rights and our equal share in the sovereignty by not submitting to the Greek Cypriots. We continued to possess all the rights and attributes emanating from the 1960 settlement, including sovereignty, by virtue of our successful defence against attempted domination.

It is therefore neither realistic nor fair to tell the Turkish Cypriots that this right, after the experience of the last 28 years, no longer exists for them. The Turkish Cypriots have as much right to be the masters of their own affairs and of their own destiny as the Greek Cypriots do. This is a consequence of the political equality of the two communities, which has been confirmed by the Security Council and which is one of the essential features of a federal solution.

The talks on Cyprus have failed to produce a final result, because the Greek Cypriot side has, among other things, persistently refused to recognize the political equality of the Turkish Cypriots. It was only six months ago, in June, that we listened, with amazement, to the words of the Greek Cypriot representative denying this fundamental principle in this very Chamber. Our amazement did not stem from the fact that we did not know the Greek Cypriot side's negative attitude towards political equality, but rather from the fact

(Mr. Ertug)

that this principle was denied in this very forum in such a blatant manner. As a brief reminder, I would like to read the verbatim record.

Mr. Mavrommatis said:

> "Equality is in the negotiating process in so far as the intercommunal talks are concerned, because you cannot equate a country with a community - there is no doubt about it - wherever that may be taking place." (S/PV.2992, p. 38)

Since the Turkish Cypriot side does not enjoy the right of reply in the Security Council, I was not able to respond to that statement at the time. But I do not think I have to respond to it even now, for I believe the Council has since given an appropriate reply to this unconstructive and provocative statement by confirming the political equality of the two communities.

The Greek Cypriot representative, who is now sitting here claiming to represent the whole of Cyprus, was only a short while ago representing the Greek Cypriot side at the intercommunal talks with the official title of Greek Cypriot negotiator. The contradiction in his position is, we believe, quite obvious: how can he claim to represent both sides in Cyprus, here or elsewhere, when he actually represents one of the parties in the dispute at the negotiations? The experience of the last 28 years has clearly shown that as long as this fundamental anomaly continues, the Greek Cypriot side is not likely to accept a power-sharing formula with the Turkish Cypriots on the basis of equality.

The Turkish Cypriot side has amply demonstrated its desire for a just and viable solution by accepting, in all its aspects, Security Council resolution 649 (1990). We believe this resolution provided, and continues to provide, a unique opportunity for making progress towards a settlement through negotiations.

(Mr. Ertug)

We can only consider the subsequent Security Council resolution, that is, resolution 716 (1991), as a confirmation of resolution 649 (1990). Since the views of the Turkish Cypriot side on resolution 716 (1991) have been expressed at the highest level - by President Rauf Denktash - I will refrain from repeating those views. However, the Council must have no doubt noticed how quick and eager the Greek Cypriot side has been in exploiting this resolution, even to the extent of attempting to add words to its text.

This is certainly not conducive to the resumption of the negotiations for a just and lasting solution. Furthermore, we believe that the attempt made in the report, which preceded this resolution, to lay blame on one of the parties is misdirected.

In spite of this, the Turkish Cypriot side has not turned its back on the negotiating process. We believe that a direct meeting between the leaders of the two communities, with a view to ironing out the differences that have prevented progress towards a solution, is still the best way for making progress.

At a time when winds of reconciliation are blowing across the world and longstanding conflicts are becoming a thing of the past, a vicious campaign of hostility is being waged in Cyprus. The perpetrators of this campaign are the Greek Cypriots; the victims, the Turkish Cypriots; and the casualty, prospects for the establishment of friendly relations between the two communities, which is the prerequisite of a feasible, workable settlement.

Many times before, representatives of my people who have addressed the Council have voiced our indignation at the incessant campaign being conducted against the Turkish Cypriots in the economic, political, social, cultural and

(Mr. Ertug)

sport fields, both within and outside Cyprus. It is regrettable that during the past six months, these hostile activities have not only continued, but have also assumed new dimensions.

A glaring example of this ill-conceived embargo is the recent sentencing by a Greek Cypriot court of a Danish sea captain, Mr. Ole Penderson, to a fine of 300 Cyprus pounds. His crime? Having previously visited Famagusta port in the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus.

In the only remaining mixed village, Pyla, located in the United Nations-controlled buffer zone, the situation continues to be tense, owing to the restrictive measures imposed on the inhabitants by the Greek Cypriot administration. This hostility manifested itself again when the village's Turkish Cypriot inhabitants tried to build a minaret to the existing mosque. Even this purely religious activity provoked a furious reaction from the Greek Cypriot side, in total disregard for the principle of religious tolerance.

Meanwhile, the Greek Cypriots are objecting to the installation of telephone lines to the homes of the Turkish Cypriot residents of Pyla, thus curtailing our people's freedom of communication.

(Mr. Ertug)

In a perhaps more ominous development, the Greek Cypriot administration has continued its campaign of spending huge sums of money on a military build-up in the south. This has also involved the acquisition of high-technology weapons. We have already communicated the details of this rearmament campaign to the Secretary-General, together with our concern over this potentially dangerous development.

Adding to our concern in this regard are the belligerent statements coming from the civilian and military authorities in the south. One recent example was the remark by General Marcopoulos, the outgoing Commander of the Greek Cypriot National Guard, that this army was:

"in a position to fight, wanted to fight and knew how to fight".

He also urged the Greek Cypriot authorities to continue the rearmament programme vigorously. We hope that the countries which are selling arms to the Greek Cypriots will review their policies in the light of this warmongering.

I should now like to comment briefly on the Secretary-General's current report (S/23263 and Add.1) on the peace-keeping operations of United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). The repeated references in this report to the so-called "Government of the Republic of Cyprus" are clearly incompatible with the legal and political realities of the island, and are unacceptable to my side. Furthermore, the report contains inaccuracies and less than impartial remarks which, we believe, detract from its objectivity.

Turning now to the question of the extension of the mandate of UNFICYP, I should like to reiterate that the resolution which has just been adopted by the Security Council is not acceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side for the reasons that were outlined in previous Security Council meetings on this

(Mr. Ertug)

matter. Any resolution that refers to the Greek Cypriot administration as the "Government of Cyprus" is unacceptable to the Turkish Cypriot side because such resolutions ignore the existing realities in Cyprus and attempt to negate the principle of equality between the two sides.

Nevertheless, the Government of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus is favourably disposed to accepting the presence of UNFICYP on its territory on the same basis as that stated in June 1991. Thus, our position continues to be that the principle, the scope, the modalities and the procedures of cooperation between the authorities of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus and UNFICYP shall be based on decisions which shall be taken by our Government.

In this connection, I should like to point out that the present mandate of UNFICYP is not compatible with the radically changed conditions and circumstances of today. In the light of the present realities in Cyprus and the approach spelled out in Security Council resolution 649 (1990), we believe that a reappraisal of UNFICYP's mandate is necessary. This would not only be in response to prevailing circumstances, but would also be in keeping with the decision to reach a settlement based on the equality of the two parties.

Before concluding my remarks, I shall avail myself of this opportunity to pay a tribute to an eminent statesman who has done so much in order to bring about a just and lasting solution to the Cyprus question, and for world peace in general. I am speaking, of course, of His Excellency Javier Perez de Cuellar, whose laudable efforts for a negotiated solution in Cyprus consist not only of his mission of good offices as Secretary-General of the United Nations, but also, previously, as Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus. He will always be remembered by our people as an

(Mr. Ertug)

untiring peacemaker and as a valued friend. On behalf of my Government and on my own behalf, I should like to express our gratitude to him and wish him good health, happiness and prosperity in the future.

I should also like to take this opportunity to congratulate the Secretary-General designate, His Excellency Boutros Boutros Ghali, whose well-deserved election to this post has been welcomed by my Government and people. He is a person who is both close to, and familiar with, our part of the world; this, for us, is a great advantage. We wish him success in his exalted task of promoting world peace and harmony.

Finally, I should like to express our appreciation for the invaluable efforts and contributions of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus, Mr. Oscar Camilion, and of Mr. Gustave Feissel. I should also like to express our appreciation for the untiring efforts of Under-Secretary-General Marrack Goulding and Force Commander Major General Clive Milner in guiding the peace-keeping operations of UNFICYP.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank Mr. Ertug for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Turkey, on whom I now call.

Mr. AKSIN (Turkey): It is a source of very great satisfaction for my delegation to see you, the representative of a country with which Turkey entertains the most cordial relations of friendship and good neighbourliness, presiding over the Council this month. Your well-known qualities as statesman and experienced diplomat will ensure that the Security Council effectively carries out its many tasks in the service of international peace and security.

I wish also to pay a tribute to Ambassador Munteanu, the distinguished Permanent Representative of Romania, for the wisdom and great skill he displayed when he presided over the Council during November.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Once again, the Security Council is engaged in its semi-annual exercise of extending the mandate of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). I should like to avail myself of this opportunity to inform the Security Council of Turkey's position vis-à-vis Cyprus.

Two weeks ago, a new Government came to power in Turkey. The new Prime Minister of Turkey, Mr. Demirel, presented his Government's programme to the Grand National Assembly, and had this to say on the subject of Cyprus:

"The Cyprus problem is currently in its 28th year. Turkey sincerely hopes that this problem will be solved without further delay and within the shortest possible time. Our Government believes that the Cyprus problem can be solved through a constructive and meaningful dialogue between the two communities, which have equal rights in the existence and future of the island.

"Our Government believes that, in view of the realities and bitter events of history, the security and prosperity of the Turkish Cypriot people can be guaranteed only by establishing a bi-zonal, bi-communal, federal partnership based on the political equality of the two sides. We still retain our hope that such a solution can be achieved through intercommunal dialogue and by peaceful means. It is not possible to accelerate this peace process by exerting foreign pressure or by expanding the scope of the problem. Within this framework, our Government will deploy all its efforts to assist in, and contribute to, the solution of the problem, and will strongly support the efforts made by the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus in this regard. We will continue to contribute to raising the level of prosperity of the Turkish Cypriot people and their development efforts by making use of all our resources."

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

This position is in conformity with Security Council resolution 649 (1990), and supports the principle of negotiation between the two Cypriot parties as the vehicle for achieving a mutually acceptable solution.

We note with concern the continuous efforts being deployed by the Greek Cypriot leadership to internationalize the question, presumably in the hope that outsiders can impose, or will impose, a settlement that is contrary to the fundamental interests of one of the parties of the future federation in Cyprus. It has to be reiterated that, when going into this kind of intimate partnership, there can be no substitute for honest, meaningful, substantive talks between the two future partners, carried out in a spirit of conciliation and mutual respect.

The Secretary-General can facilitate this exercise through his mission of good offices. The quadripartite high-level meeting envisaged in operative paragraph 8 of resolution 716 (1991) could also be a mechanism which might facilitate a mutually acceptable solution between the two parties, but it should not be seen as a mechanism for imposing solutions on parties harbouring serious misgivings.

In recent years we have seen the tragic consequences of sectarian violence in the Middle East, and we are now witnessing a repetition of this tragedy in the ethnic violence raging in parts of the Balkan peninsula. We must beware of sowing the seeds of future ethnic violence in Cyprus, which already has an unfortunate recent history of ethnic strife. The only guarantee against this danger is direct dialogue and agreement between the two peoples of the island.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

It should be mentioned, however, that dialogue will never lead to agreement without a genuine desire on the part of the two sides to reach an accommodation. Some minutes ago, we all heard Mr. Ertug, the representative in New York of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, citing some examples of the Greek Cypriot practices of hurting the Turkish Cypriots economically, politically and in any other way they can. These are not isolated incidents or the result of aberrant behaviour on the part of over-zealous officials. This is part of a systematic campaign to destroy the economy, the tourism industry, the foreign trade and, indeed, the very existence of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. This is a campaign waged on a global scale for the purpose of breaking the spirit of the Turkish Cypriot people.

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

The question of Cyprus came before the Security Council in December 1963, exactly 28 years ago, when the bi-communal republic of Cyprus split into its two ethnic components. I will not go into an analysis of why and how the division of Cyprus came about in those fateful days of December 1963. I will refrain from apportioning blame, because the facts are well known. All I will recall is that for nearly three decades the Security Council has been seized of the question of the division of Cyprus. During all these years, the Council has been adopting resolutions calling for a solution which has gradually evolved into a bi-communal, bi-zonal federation based on the political equality of the two peoples of Cyprus. Should it not be apropos to ask the question whether the relentless Greek Cypriot campaign of wearing down the Turkish Cypriots will ever lead to such a federation? The Greek Cypriots have the tiresome habit of dredging up resolutions adopted by the Security Council in the 1970s and piously calling for their strict observance. Is it not time for them to re-examine their attitudes towards their future partners? Unless they give up the policy of confrontation and adopt a policy of conciliation they will continue to violate the resolutions adopted by the Security Council in the 1990s by making the unity of Cyprus impossible.

My Government cannot accept the reference to the "Government of Cyprus" in the resolution that has just been adopted by the Council. The Council knows the basis for our position and I will not repeat it now. However, my Government has no objections to an extension of UNFICYP's mandate for a further six months.

Before concluding my statement, I want to express the gratitude of my Government for the tireless efforts of the Secretary-General, Mr. Javier Perez de Cuellar, in the accomplishment of his mission of good

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

offices. His patient efforts and his remarkable skills, coupled with his intimate knowledge of the history of the question of Cyprus, have enabled our Secretary-General to play a most useful role in facilitating the negotiating process. As we bid him farewell at the end of his tenure as Secretary-General, I would like to say that his efforts in the service of the United Nations will not be forgotten by Turkey.

Just as my Government has always extended its wholehearted support to Mr. de Cuellar in the carrying out of his mission of good offices in Cyprus, my Government will provide the same support to his successor, Mr. Boutros Ghali. We sincerely hope that the new Secretary-General will be able to build on the foundations laid by his predecessor so that a new partnership will be established between the two peoples of Cyprus after nearly three decades of conflict.

Finally, I want to express our appreciation to Mr. Oscar Camilion, the representative of the Secretary-General in Cyprus, and to Mr. Feissel for their services in support of the Secretary-General's mission of good offices. I want also to express appreciation to the men and women of UNFICYP and to their commander, Major-General Milner, for their devoted services to the United Nations.

When he made his statement, the representative of the Greek Cypriots said things which clearly need to be refuted because they do not correspond to the truth. Those allegations have been made on previous occasions and have also been refuted; and I will not take up the time of the Council by refuting them yet again.

If his counterpart, Mr. Ertug, the representative of the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, should feel the need to apprise the Council of his

(Mr. Aksin, Turkey)

Government's position on these points, I am sure he will do so in writing at a later date.

My colleague from Greece also repeated some allegations wh ch had been made previously in the Security Council and answered on those occasions. I will not prolong this debate by repeating what has been said before. I will merely recall our previous statements on the subject.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Turkey for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

I call on the representative of Cyprus.

Mr. MAVROMMATIS (Cyprus): The way in which you, Mr. President, have called upon me is the reply to the representative of the country that is occupying my country. If the representative of Turkey wishes to persist in complete isolation in the way he addresses the representative of another State party, then I think he should start an initiative to rewrite the Charter. This would be the honest thing to do instead of continuing this attitude in absolute isolation which does not become anyone who comes into this chamber.

There is another thing I wish to address. We heard something from the previous speaker on dredging up resolutions of the 1970s. I am afraid that we are the not the ones who are dredging them up. It is the members of the Council who are today recalling these resolutions. So we share the calumny, and it makes my burden that much lighter.

Let me remind the representatives of Turkey once more about another thing. They hardly mentioned resolution 716 (1991). I should like to tell them, and they know it, that Security Council resolutions are not like an à la carte menu, where they can pick and choose their hors d'oeuvres or main

(Mr. Mavrommatis, Cyprus)

course; and unless and until they learn that they have to respect all those resolutions, I do not expect that we will be making any progress. I refer in particular to the more than necessary resolution 716 (1991), as I have already explained in detail.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Greece.

Mr. EXARCHOS (Greece): At this late hour I do not want to take up the Council's precious time. I shall dwell only on two points raised by the Turkish representative.

He referred in his statement to resolution 649 (1990) as the only vehicle to a solution of the problem. I think it might be useful to recall that that resolution was adopted at the Secretary-General's request to the Security Council, following the impasse created by Mr. Denktash in February 1990 with his demand for the recognition of two peoples in the Republic of Cyprus and a separate right to self-determination for the Turkish Cypriot community. I say this because, after all, the latest resolution 716 (1991) does not do anything else. It reiterates resolution 649 (1990) and in fact completes and interprets it, and I think that those two resolutions should both be applied.

The second point raised by the representative of Turkey was his reference to political equality. So let me remind him that Security Council resolution 716 (1991) incorporated the Secretary-General's definition of political equality to be exercised within the new Cyprus Federal State as he had outlined in his report of 8 March 1990. In that report the Secretary-General specified that political equality did not mean equal numerical participation in all federal organs, but that it should be reflected in various ways, including the equality and identical powers and functions of the two federated

(Mr. Exarchos, Greece)

States, the approval of the Constitution and control of the process of *constitutional amendment by both communities, the effective participation in* al decisions and organs of the Federal Government, and safeguards to ensure protection of both communities against possible detrimental decisions of the Federal Government.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There are no further speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 6.20 p.m.